

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Examiner's objections, rejections and comments in the Office Action of July 18, 2005 and have prepared the following response.

Claims 2-7, 9-19 and 21 remain pending in this application. Initially, Applicants express appreciation that the Examiner has indicated claim 14 is in condition for allowance and that claims 2, 9 and 21 would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Turning now to the issues raised in the Office Action, claims 5, 7, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 17 because the specification was not clear as to how the output comprises a resistance, and rejected claims 7 and 19 because the specification was not clear as to how the output comprises a network message. Applicants note that the above amendments to claims 5, 7, 17 and 19 are believed to obviate the Examiner's stated rejection of claims 5, 7, 17 and 19 by appropriately amending the claims to reflect the fact that the output cited by the claims comprises a value that may consist of a resistance value, current value, network message value or voltage value as is well known in the art. Support for these amendments can be found in Paragraph [0016] of the Specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8, 11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman (U.S. Patent 5,184,510, hereinafter

"Rossman"), claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman in view of Chung (U.S. Patent 4,702,316, hereinafter "Chung"), and claims 5-7 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rossman. Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections, and request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following comments. As previously stated, the Examiner has indicated that claims 2, 9 and 21 would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. By this paper, Applicants have canceled claims 1, 8 and 20, amended claims 3-7, 10-12 and 16-19, and rewritten claims 2, 9 and 21 in independent form. As such, Applicants contend that independent claims 2, 9 and 21 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination. With respect to the remaining dependent claims 3-7, 10-13 and 15-19, without conceding the Examiner's position, Applicants contend these claims are allowable as a result of the dependency, either directly or indirectly, from newly amended independent claims 2, 9 or 21.

Finally, by this Response, Applicants have rewritten Claims 2, 9 and 21 in independent form and hereby authorize the Examiner to charge our deposit account 03-1800. An appropriate Fee Transmittal sheet is attached to this Response.

From the foregoing, Applicants submit that the remaining claims in this patent application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims and passage of the application to issue are courteously requested. If a telephone

conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference with the undersigned is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 22, 2005

By: 

Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519

Attorney for Applicants